Editor, Book World
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20071

2/16/92

Athan Theoharis' reply to Mark North's complaints (Book World 2/16/92) about his review (12/ 15/91 Book World) is enormouly understated. North's silly, slipshod and baseless book is one of the trashiest of the exploitations and commercializations of the JFK assassination. It is so sick and childish that I discontinued suffering it in my annotations of these disinformational works for the historical record.

North refers to his fictional account of the assassination, about which he is profoundly ignorant, as " a comprehensive analysis of all available, relevant historical data". In his book's "Author's Note" he says it is a comprehensive analysis of all books ... pertaining to...Hoover.. and the assassination..." Both are, in plain English, lies.

Of the many obvious proofs is that I have and those to whom North expresses thanks for their help know, whether or not North knew enough about the subject matter to know himself, about a quarter of a million pages of once-withheld government records obtained by a series of well-known FOIA lawsuits that I make available to all writers. North did not ask to see them and his book, which lists no sources at all in its 671 pages, makes no reference to them.

He is so ignorant of the works listed in his bibliography his can't spell authors' names. And, of course, his "all" does not include "all" the serious works while missing none of the trash.

This sloppiness extends to the editing. He misspells the name of one of his special villains, William Weisberg, repeatedly, even on a page in which it is spelled correctly.(329)

North represents that "the historical record" does "implicate the mafia in Kennedy's assassination." This is false. The unproven conjectures he really refers to are <u>not</u> "the historical record." I doubt if anyone has and has read as many of the actual records as I and neither they nor the books seeking to blame the mafia for the assassination justify what North says. There likewise is not even a rational suspicion of Hoover's guilt.

North praises his publisher for courage in also publishing "Best Evidence," which

was first published by Macmillan, and "Crossfire." North's scholarship and judgement can be evaluated by his singling these two books out for special mention.

The first, aside from taking credit for all the fact about the assassination previously published, adds only an absolutely impossible theory, that the corpse was stolen and toyed with, ~~it~~ its alleged proof is disproven in its basic alleged source.

The second, by an author profoundly ignorant of and indifferent to established fact about the assassination, is a compendium of all the nutty theories presented as fact - and the author doesn't even understand them.

Illustrative of Lawyer North's integrity and intentions is his accusing the safely-dead Hoover of treason ~~yet~~ while in 671 pages he does not quote the pertinent 19-~~word~~ words of Article III Section 3 of the Constitution, which defines it. He has two pages on "The Elements of Treason" (47-8) where he "defines" ~~He undertakes to "define"~~ treason without once stating that it is exclusively a wartime offense.

For a ~~lay~~ lawyer this is not an oversight, particularly not when he defines "treason" from a secondary source and omits the quotation of the mere 19 operative words and their requirement of a state of war.

By the time North had completed his atrocity of disinformation, misinformation, childish speculation and ignorance he remained ignorant of the basic functioning of the FBI about which and its founding director he wrote and about the crime itself.

What finds no difficulty being published about our political assassination is ~~limited to~~ what further confuses the people and buries truth deeper. Of these North's is one of the wrost most and indecent.

Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg